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I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Academic Council (Goldenberg)
Administrative Council (Cooper)
CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Weatherby, Wenzl)
Foundation Board (Riedlsperger)
President's Council (Riedlsperger)

IV. Committee Reports

Budget (Conway)
Constitution and Bylaws (O'Toole)
Curriculum (Greenwald)
Distinguished Teaching Award (Suchand)
Election (Weber)
Faculty Library (Slem)
Fairness Board (Rosenman)

V. Business Items

TIME CERTAIN: Discussion with President Baker (3:15 PM)

✓ A. Distribution of Promotion Funds (Executive Committee) (First Reading)
✓ B. Academic Calendar (Brown) (Second Reading)
✓ C. Funding for Promotion (Goldenberg) (Second Reading)
✓ D. Teaching Overloads (Lewis) (Tabled from 1-22-80)
✓ E. Coursework Taken by Faculty for Credit (Goldenberg) (Second Reading)
✓ F. Teaching Requirement for Administrators with Academic Titles (Goldenberg) (Second Reading)
✓ G. Sabbatical Leaves (Goldenberg) (Second Reading)
✓ H. Final Examinations (Goldenberg) (Second Reading)
✓ I. Credit/No Credit Grading in Support Courses (Brown) (First Reading)
✓ J. Curriculum Committee Resolutions (Greenwald) (First Reading)
RESOLUTION REGARDING ACADEMIC SENATE INVOLVEMENT 
IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROMOTION FUNDS

Background Rationale: President Baker has announced that the budget for 1980-1981 provide $66,662 for promotions. This is an increase over last year's allocation of $52,336, but it should be noted that the cost of a promotion to associate professor has increased from $670 to $770, and the cost of a promotion to professor has risen from $860 to $1,000. There are 158 faculty members eligible for promotion and funds to promote approximately 45 percent of these.

It is anticipated that dollar ceiling allocations will be established for candidates eligible for promotion and relative to the cost of those promotions.

President Baker has asked the school deans to submit to the Academic Vice President by March 10, a list of their recommendations for promotion ranked in a single priority listing and a second alphabetical list of those not recommended. In the light of these tight fiscal constraints, the President has emphasized that recommendations should be based on thorough and well-documented evaluation so as to insure that the best qualified faculty in terms of merit and ability are promoted.

Since the dollar ceiling allocations will not precisely coincide with the cost of the promotions, it is anticipated that there will exist surpluses not adequate to promote the next recommended person on a school/division list, but which when taken together from among all the schools/division, may produce enough money to promote one or more additional faculty members. For this reason, President Baker has requested that the Vice President Jones work with the Chair of the Academic Senate to establish an ad hoc university committee with membership from the seven schools and one division to be consulted regarding the use of any such money after the promotion recommendations within the assigned dollar ceiling allocations have been made.

Last year, Vice President Jones made a similar request which was declined by the Executive Committee on the grounds that cooperation in a process that would select some faculty members for promotion would implicitly support the denial of promotion to others who, in accordance with university procedures specified in CAM 342.2.B have been judged worthy of promotion based on evaluation of their merit and ability. At an Executive Committee meeting of January 29, 1980, the Executive Committee again recommended that the Academic Senate should not be a party to a practice forced on the university by external, artificial, fiscal constraints which it feels to be in violation of university policy and directed the Chair of the Academic Senate to draft a resolution declining the request of the President. Since there is time this year to submit this question to the
WHEREAS, Paragraph 342.2.B of the Campus Administrative Manual specifies that "promotion in rank . . . is granted only in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank;" and

WHEREAS, Paragraph 342.2.B of the Campus Administrative Manual stipulates that "recommendations for promotion of individuals are based on the factors and subfactors listed on the Faculty Evaluation Form with emphasis on merit and ability in each factor;" and

WHEREAS, The amount of money provided by the State of California for promotions this year is anticipated to be inadequate to promote all faculty members who have been deemed worthy of promotion on the basis of the factors specified in the Campus Administrative Manual; and

WHEREAS, Cooperation in a process which in recommending how surplus funds should be applied to support some additional promotions implicitly provides the means for denying promotion to other faculty members who have also been judged worthy of promotion; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo declines the request by the President for consultation regarding the use of any available promotion funds after promotion recommendations have been made by the school deans.
RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

WHEREAS,  The advent of computer assisted registration frees two days each quarter which must be included in the academic calendar; and

WHEREAS,  It is desirable to have approximately equal numbers of each class days per quarter for scheduling purposes; and

WHEREAS,  It is desirable for final examination periods to be separated from the last class meeting by at least two calendar days; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, recommends that the additional six days per academic year be utilized so that:

1. The first day of instruction in each quarter will be a Monday.

2. The last day of instruction in each quarter will be a Friday.

3. Final examination periods in each quarter will be the full week following the last day of instruction, whenever possible.
Notes and Comments Regarding the Proposed Calendar Modifications:

1. Meeting both the resolution requirements and the Chancellor’s Council of Presidents’ adoption that 147 instructional days per academic year should be “typical,” would require an eleven week fall quarter (as we now have) with Veteran’s Day and the normal three day Thanksgiving break as holidays, and ten week winter and spring quarters with one holiday in each (Washington’s Birthday and Memorial Day, respectively). The total number of instruction days is 149 in every year.

2. Meeting the resolution requirements and the Council of Presidents adopted minimum of 170 academic work days per academic year would require a full week in the fall quarter for the fall conference and academic planning, a full week (five days) each quarter for examinations and end of quarter evaluation, and commencement day.

3. The calendar that results from 1 and 2 above and the resolution has the following features:
   a. There are no fewer than nine equivalent class days in any quarter—and the equivalent number of class days per quarter is typically ten.
   b. Final examination periods are separated by a weekend from the last day of instruction.
   c. There is one full week of academic holiday between the winter and spring quarters and three full weeks between fall and winter quarters.
   d. Allowing five days per final exam period could:
      i. Allow distribution of exams over five days in order to reduce the crowding in the exam schedule (and perhaps eliminate the 7:00 AM exam slot);
      ii. Include the possibility of an additional “dead day” between classes and finals (which would then begin on Tuesday of exam week) to allow for additional study, office consultation, or an official final deadline for submitting papers, etc.;
      iii. Include as an official academic work day an evaluation day set aside for reading final exams and papers and for submitting grades. Such an evaluation day is authorized by the Council of Presidents, but is not currently included in our calendar.
      iv. Eliminate the current practice of certain classes (Friday classes meeting once per week) holding final exams on the last class day.
PROPOSED ACADEMIC CALENDAR 1979-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMER</th>
<th>FALL CONFERENCE</th>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FALL CONFERENCE**

- 10 WEEKS (INDEPENDENCE DAY)
- 1 EXAMS
- 1 WEEK HOLIDAY
- 1 FALL CONFERENCE
- 11 WEEKS (THANKSGIVING)
- VETERAN'S DAY
- 3 WEEKS HOLIDAY
- 10 WEEKS (WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY)
- 1 FINALS
- 1 WEEK HOLIDAY
- 52 WEEKS

**SUMMER**

- 1 FinALS
- 1 HOLIDAY

**INSTRUCTION DAYS**

- 170 ACADEMIC WORK DAYS
- 149 INSTRUCTION DAYS F W S
- 49 INSTRUCTION DAYS SUMMER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980-81</th>
<th></th>
<th>1981-82</th>
<th></th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMER</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>Aug 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER</td>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jan 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classes**

**Finals**

**Fall Conference**

**Commencement**
RESOLUTION REGARDING TEACHING OVERLOADS

WHEREAS, The faculty of this university have a commitment to excellence in teaching, a responsibility to provide their students with the best possible opportunity for education, and a responsibility to remain competent in their academic disciplines; and

WHEREAS, 36 WTU/year is the maximum teaching load that a university faculty member can reasonably be expected to carry and maintain the quality of teaching and level of professional competence required by a university teaching position; and

WHEREAS, Too many faculty are already teaching more than 36 WTU/year; and

WHEREAS, Teaching loads in excess of 36 WTU/year diminish the time available for students, the time available for class preparation, the time available to conduct the business of the department, and the time available to maintain professional competence to such a degree that the integrity of the university is threatened and the credibility of the university is called into question, the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo,

RESOLVES: That no faculty member should be required to teach more than 36 WTU/year.
RESOLUTION REGARDING TEACHING OVERLOADS

RESOLVED: That we reaffirm our commitment to the resolution regarding teaching loads that was passed unanimously by the Academic Senate in April of 1973 (below).

Using the available data for the Fall term of 1978 for comparison, the student credit hours per FTEF were 274, the student/faculty ratio was 18.3, and the average WTUs per FTEF were 13.4.

(April 1973: Teaching Overloads Resolution)

We, the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, are concerned that the teaching effectiveness is minimized by an excessive workload for the faculty of the California State University and Colleges. The student credit hours taught by the average faculty member has increased from 259 during Fall 1970 to 276 during Fall 1971. Likewise, the student-faculty ratio has increased from 17.3 during Fall 1970 to 18.4 during Fall 1971. The average weighted teaching unit per faculty member has increased from 12.4 in the Fall of 1970 to 12.8 in the Fall 1971. In addition, the current philosophy of consultation at all levels has greatly increased the amount of committee work per faculty member far in excess of that ever conceived by those who devised the faculty workload formula. The faculty needs more time to devote to:

Interaction with and attention to individual students.
Free exchange of ideas with students and other faculty members.
Preparation of current course material.
Innovation and improvement of teaching techniques.
Evaluation of student performance.
Professional development in order to remain current with rapidly advancing knowledge.

We recommend that the faculty and administrators of the California State University system work toward increasing teaching effectiveness by:

1) Seeking ways to reduce the faculty-student ratio as well as the student credit hours taught per faculty member.
2) Discouraging faculty from participating on more than one time-consuming committee or administrative assignment. These assignments should be distributed equitably throughout the faculty.

3) Discouraging each faculty member from teaching more than 36 weighted teaching units per year. This agrees with the maximum (not optimum) workload suggested by the American Association of University Professors.

4) Discouraging faculty from teaching more than six separate course-preparations during the academic year (unless the course content or teaching method traditionally requires little preparation).

5) Discouraging faculty from teaching more than six separate course-preparations during the academic year (unless the instructor is newly hired and then his preparations should be limited to as few as possible).

6) Seeking ways to reduce workloads (without increasing the workloads of others) for those who are (a) introducing a new course or substantially revising an old course, (b) involved in developing other teaching procedures, (c) engaged in significant professional development activities.
Background: The completion of an advanced degree is undertaken by many while continuing to work in a special discipline. While continuing education should be encouraged, some classroom situations which occur may be cumbersome due to the relationship of the teacher and student.

One such condition which would, in some cases, become awkward is that of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member taking a class or classes in his/her own department.

The situation would present "appearance" problems in that favoritism may be construed as a part of classroom evaluation. Also, it would put the teacher in an awkward situation if the expectations and standards of the class were not properly met by the student.

RESOLVED: A degree will not be recognized by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo for RPT, which includes classes taken within a tenure-track faculty's own department.
RESOLUTION ON TEACHING REQUIREMENT FOR ADMINISTRATORS WITH ACADEMIC TITLES

Background Information:

There are currently 34 administrators who hold academic rank titles, not including academic department heads. Of these, 26 have teaching service areas in 18 departments. Trends in faculty staffing show an increase in the faculty/student ratio from 15.7 in 1969-70 to 17.4 in 1978-79. This reflects past state policy changes in budget determination. Given the steady-state situation and enrollment ceiling, the current ratio is not expected to change significantly.

WHEREAS, There is a significant number of full-time administrators who hold academic titles with designated teaching areas to many departments; and

WHEREAS, It is appropriate for those administrators who have designated teaching service areas to maintain a substantive connection with their disciplines; and

WHEREAS, Those administrators making faculty RPT judgments would profit by first-hand exposure to student evaluation of faculty and its role in overall RPT considerations; and

WHEREAS, The faculty needs to be more directly involved with, and share responsibility for, administrative decisions affecting faculty affairs, which require some release time; and

WHEREAS, Administrators with academic titles could help mitigate the negative impact of fiscal constraints and higher student/faculty ratios by taking some direct part of the institution's essential purpose; and

WHEREAS, Efforts to diffuse the boundaries between administrators and faculty would promote better understanding of roles and contribute to improved morale; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That all personnel with academic titles and designated teaching service areas be required to teach at least one three unit course per year in the designated teaching service area.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLUTION REGARDING SABBATICAL LEAVES

WHEREAS, Title V states that sabbatical leaves are specifically for study and travel; and
WHEREAS, CAM may be more restrictive than Title V, but not less restrictive; and
WHEREAS, A sabbatical leave intent on study could also result in publications, dissertations included; therefore be it
RESOLVED: That Section 386.5.C.1a be deleted, and be it further
RESOLVED: That Sections 386.5.C.1b and 1c be relabeled 386.5.C.1a and 386.5.C.1b, respectively.

386.5.C.1a --- When the purpose is for meeting minimum standards published by the department for retention, tenure, or promotion.
RESOLUTION ON FINAL EXAMINATION

WHEREAS, There have been numerous complaints from students that final examinations given during the last days of the instructional period place them under undue pressure; and

WHEREAS, Faculty have the right to expect that their student's attention not be distracted from instruction by final examinations administered during the last days of a quarter; and

WHEREAS, Students have the right to take examinations in an atmosphere free from the normal pace of the regular daily schedule; and

WHEREAS, Faculty have a professional responsibility to maintain the integrity of final examinations; and

WHEREAS, CAM 484.2 provides for exemption in cases where there are more appropriate means for the evaluation of student work; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, urge all faculty members to adhere to the final examination schedule unless specific exemption has been made.
RESOLUTION REGARDING CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING IN SUPPORT COURSES

Background: Credit/No Credit Grading was implemented to ease the burden on students taking elective courses outside their own areas of concentration. The intent was to allow, or even encourage, students to take courses well outside their own disciplines by reducing the grade competition with majors in those areas.

Many students taking courses on a Credit/No Credit basis will set their goals on obtaining credit rather than on obtaining an in-depth understanding of the material covered. In courses which offer support to a major program, this can mean that a student will be underprepared in later major courses.

Also, it sometimes happens that students take required support courses on a Credit/No Credit basis without realizing some of the ramifications of doing so. It can happen, for example, that a change of major to a department in which "support courses" had been previously taken Credit/No Credit will now require a letter grade if the course is to be used toward the new major. And many students are not aware at the time they apply for Credit/No Credit grading in a support course that future employers or graduate schools often look at the performance in both major and support courses in their evaluation of an applicant.

In April of 1979, the Academic Council unanimously passed a resolution to change CAM to disallow Credit/No Credit grading in courses which appear in the support column on a major curriculum sheet.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo recommends that CAM Section 617.5.E be revised as follows:

f. Courses required in for the student's major which are specified in either the major or support column (designated with the "M" on the student's major curriculum sheet) may not be taken for Credit/No Credit grading, with the exception of those courses taken as credit by examination and those offered on a Credit/No Credit basis only.
Background for Resolution on Department Curriculum Committee

Some departments have no curriculum committee at the present time nor written guidelines for dealing with catalog proposals. As a result procedural disputes have occurred at the departmental level which in many cases, have been difficult or impossible to settle at a higher level. Concerns have also arisen about the lack of faculty involvement.

Resolution on Department Curriculum Committees

Whereas, Procedural disputes have occurred concerning curriculum issues, and

Whereas, Curriculum development should originate with the faculty of a department, be it

Resolved: That each department establish a Curriculum Committee, and further

Resolved: That this committee shall be responsible for review and revision of the curriculum of the department, and further

Resolved: That this committee and the appropriate Department Head shall coordinate a timetable for dealing with catalog proposals, and further

Resolved: That this committee shall consult with the appropriate Department Head in determining guidelines for dealing with curriculum issues, and further

Resolved: That these guidelines shall be approved by the appropriate Dean.
BACKGROUND FOR RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL/DIVISION COMMITTEES

Some schools/divisions have no school/division curriculum committee at the present time. Many conflicts concerning catalog proposals occur between departments within a school/division. In the absence of school/division curriculum committee, the curriculum committee of the Academic Senate has been forced to attempt to settle these conflicts. These settlements could have been made more easily at an earlier stage. A school/division committee would have provided a better forum for dealing with the problems since all departments involved in the dispute would be represented. The level of expertise should presumably also be higher within a given school/division.

RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL/DIVISION CURRICULUM COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Many conflicts concerning curriculum proposals occur between departments within a school/division; and

WHEREAS, It is to the mutual advantage of all concerned to settle these disputes as soon as possible; and

WHEREAS, In the absence of a School/Division Curriculum Committee, the Dean is forced to attempt these settlements; be it

RESOLVED: That each School/Division be required to set up a Curriculum Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this committee shall be charged with determining guidelines for dealing with curriculum issues; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these guidelines shall be approved by the appropriate School/Division Council; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this committee and the appropriate Dean shall coordinate a timetable for dealing with catalog proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED: Each department in the appropriate School/Division shall elect a representative to this committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the School/Division Curriculum Committee shall contact and consult with all departments involved in a dispute or problem involving curriculum issues before making its final decision.
Background for Resolution Regarding the Curriculum Process

At present, we have a dual track curriculum process whereby catalog proposals are simultaneously reviewed by the Academic Affairs Staff and the Academic Senate. This process has led to considerable duplication of effort since both groups are doing the same review. At the same time this process has made communications between the two groups difficult since the two groups are rarely at the same point in their respective reviews.

As a result, problems have arisen. Among the problems are the following:

1. Some Departments had thought that they had negotiated settlements only to discover that these settlements were not in the approved package.
2. The Academic Senate has had little input in the vital curriculum process.
3. Because of the sheer volume of proposals, this duplication of effort has resulted in difficulty in adequately reviewing all proposals.

**EXISTING CATALOG CYCLE**

Department

\[\downarrow\]

Department Head

\[\downarrow\]

Dean

\[\rightarrow\]

Vice President for Academic Affairs

\[\rightarrow\]

Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

\[\rightarrow\]

President


**PROPOSED CATALOG CYCLE**

Department

\[\downarrow\]

Department Curriculum Committee

\[\downarrow\]

Department Head

\[\downarrow\]

School Curriculum Committee

\[\downarrow\]

Dean

\[\rightarrow\]

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

\[\rightarrow\]

Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

\[\rightarrow\]

Academic Senate

\[\rightarrow\]

President or his/her designee
Resolution Regarding the Curriculum Process

Whereas, The current process has led to much duplication of effort, and

Whereas, The current process has led to a lack of communication between different groups involved in the process, be it

Resolved: That a single track curriculum process be established, and be it further

Resolved: That Section 490.3 of CAM be rewritten so as to read:
Schedule and Processing of Proposed Changes

Proposals for changes in the Catalog courses and curricula generally originate in the departments. The faculty of a department through a department curriculum committee shall be responsible for review and revision of its curriculum. Summary statements of proposed changes with supporting forms and attachments are developed on a departmental basis and forwarded through the Academic Senate for review, consultation, and recommendation. All proposals which have been approved by the faculty of the department shall be forwarded at each step to the appropriate body as specified below. The faculty of the concerned department shall be provided with a written rationale for any negative actions by each of these bodies. Final action on changes of a policy nature is by the President or his/her designee.

The following procedural steps are intended for the information and guidance of those who are concerned and/or involved in the processing of proposed changes for the Catalog. The time schedule for a two-year Catalog indicated below will be followed as closely as circumstances permit. The first odd year of the catalog cycle shall be designated by A, the even year designated by B, and the final year shall be designated by C. (Forms for processing course proposals are available in the school offices.)

July, 1977 A through December 1, 1977 A:

Department-review and development of-the-1979-81-proposals Departments shall review and develop proposals. All approved proposals shall be forwarded to the Department Head. The Department Head shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the appropriate School Curriculum Committee.

December 1, 1977 A through February 15, 1978 B:

Dean’s-review, evaluation-consultation-with-faculty-and-submission-of catalog-proposals The School Curriculum Committee shall consult with the faculty in reviewing and evaluating the proposals. These proposals shall then be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Review-by-Vice-President-for-Academic Affairs, Academic Senate, and Academic Council: The Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or Academic Affairs staff shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate. The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall review and evaluate the proposals and forward all proposals to the President.

Final-review-and-decisions-by-the-President-and-Presidency: The President or his/her designee shall review and make the final decisions.

The Deans' offices shall prepare the layout and submit the final copy. The Deans' offices shall prepare the layout and submit the final copy.

Preparation-and-submission-of-manuscript-to-printer, checking-of-galley-and-page-proof, printing, binding: The manuscript shall be prepared and submitted to the printer. The galley and page proofs shall be checked. The catalog shall be printed and bound.
RESOLUTION REGARDING TIMETABLE
for the Curriculum Committee
and the Academic Affairs Staff

Whereas, No timetable exists for the review by the Academic Affairs Staff and the Curriculum Committee for the Academic Senate, be it

Resolved: That the Academic Affairs Staff and the Curriculum Committee for the Academic Senate shall coordinate a timetable for dealing with catalog proposals.